

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X
CHRISTOPHER CASTORINA and)
STEVEN MORSE,) Civil Case No:
)
Plaintiffs,)
)
v.) 2:10-CV-02954-JS-ARL
)
SPIKE CABLE NETWORKS, INC., NETWORK)
ENTERPRISES, MTV NETWORKS, VIACOM, INC.,)
INDUSTRY ENTERTAINMENT, CBS CORPORATION)
ABC CORPORATIONS, 1-10 fictitious (corporations);)
XYZ CORPORATIONS, 1-10 (fictitious corporations);)
ABC TALENT AGENCIES, (fictitious agencies);)
XYZ TALENT AGENCIES, 1-10 (fictitious agencies);)
TALENT AGENTS JOHN DOES 1-10 (fictitious agents);)
TALENT AGENTS JANE DOES 1-10, (fictitious agents).)
)
Defendants,)
-----X

**MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS'
SPIKE CABLE NETWORKS, INC., NETWORK ENTERPRISES, MTV NETWORKS,
VIACOM INC. AND CBS CORPORATION'S MOTION TO DISMISS**

DEJESU MAIO & ASSOCIATES

Donna D. Maio (DD2547)

Attorneys for Plaintiff

191 New York Avenue

Huntington, NY 11743

Phone: (631) 549-1400

Fax : (631) 425-7030

Donna.Maio@DMDAttorneys.com

Attorney for Plaintiffs

Christopher Castorina and Steven Morse

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PRELIMINARY STATEMENT.....	1
STATEMENT OF FACTS.....	2
APPLICABLE STANDARDS.....	5
Standards for Determining Substantial Similarities.....	7
A. Common Pattern Test.....	7
B. Total Concept and Feel Test.....	8
C. Fragment Literal Similarity Test.....	8
ARGUMENT.....	9
I. DEFENDANTS DO NOT SATISFY THEIR BURDEN FOR A MOTION TO DISMISS BECAUSE THEIR ANALYSIS OF SUBSTANTIAL SIMILARITY IMPROPERLY FILTERS OUT STOCK AND GENERIC ELEMENTS.....	9
II. THE COURT SHOULD APPLY THE TEST SET FORTH IN <i>METCALF</i>	10
III. EVEN WHEN APPLYING THE TOTAL CONCEPT AND FEEL TEST DISMISSAL IS NOT APPROPRIATE.....	13
i. Plot.....	14
ii. Sequence of events.....	14
iii. Setting.....	16
iv. Pace.....	17
v. Tone.....	18
vi. Characters.....	18
vii. Theme.....	19

IV.	PLAINTIFFS SHOULD HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO PRESENT FACTS WHICH ARE APPLICABLE TO THE FRAGMENTED LITERAL SIMILARITY TEST.....	20
...		
V.	DISSIMILARITY BETWEEN SOME ASPECTS OF THE WORKS WILL NOT AUTOMATICALLY RELIEVE THE INFRINGEMENT OF LIABILITY.....	21
VI.	THE CASES CITED BY DEFENDANTS ARE DISTINGUISHABLE FROM THE CASE AT BAR.....	22
	CONCLUSION.....	25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
<i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> , 129 S. Ct. 1937 (2009).....	5
<i>Barris/Fraser Enterprises v. Goodson-Todman Enterprises, Ltd.</i> , 988 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 146 (S.D.N.Y. 1988).....	9
<i>Bethea v. Burnett</i> 2005 WL 1720631 (C.D.Cal. June 28, 2005).....	25
<i>Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly</i> , 550 U.S. 544 (2007).....	5
<i>Berkic v. Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer/United Artists Entm't Co.</i> , 761 F.2d 1289 (9 th Cir. 1985).....	7
<i>Castle Rock Entm't, Inc. v. Carol Publ'g Group, Inc.</i> , 150 F.3d 132 (2d Cir. 1998).....	6, 8, 20
<i>CBS Broad Inc. v. ABC Inc.</i> , 2003 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 20258 (S.D.N.Y. Jan 14, 2004).....	8, 10, 24
Daniel Fox, <i>Harsh Realities: Substantial Similarity in the Reality Television Context</i> , 13 UCLA Ent. L. Rev. 223 (2006).....	11, 12, 24
Daniel A. Fiore and Samuel Rogoway, <i>Feature: Reality Check: A Recent Court Decision Indicates that Traditional Copyright Analysis Maybe Used to Protect Reality TV Shows From Infringement</i> , 28 Los Angeles Lawyer 34.....	12, 24
<i>Feist Publ'n, Inc. v Rural Tell. Serv., Co.</i> 499 US 340 (1991).....	9
<i>Hoehling v. Universal City Studios, Inc.</i> , 618 F. 2d 972 (2d Cir. 1980).....	7
<i>Harper & Row Publishers, Inc. v. Nation Enter.</i> 471 US 539 (1985).....	21
<i>Iqbal v. Hasty</i> , 490 F.3d 143 (2d Cir. 2007).....	5

<i>Judith Ripka Designs v. Preville</i> , 935 F Supp 237 (S.D.N.Y. 1996).....	6
<i>Kenbrooke Fabrics, Inc. v. Hollan Fabrics, Inc.</i> , 602 F Supp 151 (SDNY 1984).....	6
<i>Kregos v. Associated Press</i> , 3 F.3d 656 (2d Cir. 1993).....	6
<i>Metcalf v. Bochco</i> , 294 F.3d 1069 (9th Cir. 2002).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Milano v. NBC Universal, Inc.</i> 584 F. Supp. 2d 1288 (C.D.Cal. 2008).....	25
<i>Peter Pan Fabrics, Inc. v. Martin Weinder Corp.</i> , 274 F.2d 487 (2d Cir. 1960)	
<i>Pino v. Viacom Inc.</i> , 2008 WL 704386 (D.N.J. Mar, 2008).....	20, 22, 23
<i>Rodriguez v. Heidi Klum Co.</i> , 2008 WL 4449416, at *5 (S.D.N.Y. Sept 30, 2008).....	24
<i>Rogers v. Koons</i> , 960 F.2d 301 (2d Cir. 1992).....	7, 21
<i>Shaw v. Lindheim</i> , 919 F.2d 1353, 1363 (9th Cir. 1990).....	7, 8
<i>Sheldon v. Metro-Goldwyn Pictures Corp.</i> , 81 F.2d 49 (2d Cir. 1936).....	21
<i>Sid & Marty Krofft Television Prod., Inc. v McDonald's Corp.</i> , 562 F.2d 1157 (9 th Cir. 1997).....	7
<i>Tufenkian Imp./Exp. Ventures, Inc. v. Einstein Moomjy, Inc.</i> 338 F.3d 127 (2d Cir. 2003).....	9
<i>Warner Bros., Inc. v. ABC, Inc.</i> , 720 F.2d 231 (2d Cir. 1983).....	21

<i>Wickham v. Knoxville Int’l Energy Exposition, Inc.</i> , 739 F. 2d 1094 (6 th Cir. 1984).....	7
<i>Williams v. Crichton</i> , 84 F.3d 581 (2d Cir. 1996).....	21
<i>Valez v. SONY Discos</i> , 2007 WL 120686 (S.D.N.Y. 2007).....	9